

**Draft Summary of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
August 23, 2001**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting on August 23, 2001 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present an informational summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Flip Chart Notes
Attachment 4	Existing Information Matrix
Attachment 5	Information Needs Matrix
Attachment 6	Revised Issue Sheets – August 23, 2001

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees with their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes taken during the meeting are included as Attachment 3.

One participant asked Michael Pierce to clarify whom the Butte County Relicensing Team represents. Michael responded the Butte County Board of Supervisors authorized Supervisor Beeler to assemble a group of residents and County employees to represent Butte County in Work Group and Plenary Group meetings during the relicensing effort. The Team is tasked with attending the various relicensing meetings, collecting information, and providing input to the relicensing effort.

Action Items – July 26, 2001 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting

A summary of the July 26, 2001 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group is posted on the project web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

Action Item #R27:	Provide "existing information" to information library for project.
Status:	Dale Hoffman-Floerke reported that this effort is underway. Information will be available in hard-copy form in the Recreation Binder at the library and new information would be added to the binder as needed. Doug Rischbieter of DWR added that DWR Northern District is scanning some of the information so that it can be placed on the Relicensing Web Site.
Action Item #R28:	Provide sub-Task Force draft screening criteria for Interim Projects to entire T.F. prior to next meeting.
Status:	Dale reported that the Interim Projects Task Force used the new criteria at their meeting today. A detailed report on the Interim Projects Task Force is included on tonight's agenda.
Action Item #R29:	Review revised Issue Sheets and provide additional information to DWR.
Status:	Doug Rischbieter reported that one Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group participant provided comments. He added that these comments are included in the

revised Issue Sheets distributed to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group for this meeting.

Interim Projects Task Force Update

At their previous meeting, the Interim Projects Task Force assembled a sub-group to develop more detailed criteria by which to evaluate the 42 remaining Interim Projects. The sub-group was comprised of Pete Dangermond, Steve Nachtman, Craig Jones, Dale Hoffman-Floerke and the Facilitator. They met twice and developed a ranking methodology based on an expanded list of 18 evaluation criteria including location, recreational components, impact to existing resources, economic issues, etc. Using a matrix, the sub-group evaluated each project on the Interim list on a scale of 1 to 5 against the new criteria prior to the Task Force meeting. The Task Force met earlier today and, after some discussion about the rating scale, the Task Force participants completed the matrix as well. Dale added that the Task Force could now rank each project by their cumulative score. Additional scores can be factored into the cumulative scores. The goal is to move forward a package of 8 to 12 projects to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group and then on to the Plenary Group. Dale stressed that the full Interim Projects Task Force would meet again to consider the ranking methodology and preliminary information developed by the ranking method and matrix before any results can be reported. She expects the Interim Projects Task Force to meet twice before approving a list for consideration by the Recreation and Socioeconomic Work Group. The next Interim Project Task Force meeting is scheduled for September 21, 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. at the Oroville Field Division. Dale reminded the group that regardless of the preliminary ranking, additional information would be needed on most of the Interim Projects to produce a package ready for consideration.

Study Development Task Force

At their previous meeting, the Recreation and Socioeconomic Work Group formed a Task Force to review each Issue Sheet, organize existing information, determine information needs, and develop a list of proposed studies that will address the information needs. Doug Rischbieter of DWR reported that the Task Force has not yet met. However, Doug has taken the current lists of existing information and information needs and organized them into draft matrices. The matrices were distributed to the Recreation and Socioeconomic Work Group for review and comment. Participants were asked to look over each matrix to identify gaps in information or to suggest other sources of information and forward their comments and suggestions to Doug. Doug's e-mail address is dougr@water.ca.gov. Doug reminded everyone that these are not complete lists and would be reviewed and expanded by the Task Force. The draft matrices of Existing Information and Information Needs are appended to this summary as Attachments 4 and 5, respectively.

Patricia Watters representing MWD, reminded participants that good study results are the product of good study design, and good Existing Information and Information Needs lists help in this effort. Additionally, she advised participants that represent recreation interests to provide survey data or professional organization references, including web sites to Doug.

Issue Sheet Development

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group reviewed revised draft Issue Sheets including comments made by participants at last month's Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting.

The Facilitator reviewed the status of Issue Sheet development since the last meeting. Issue Sheets S1 and S2 remained in redline/strikeout format since they had not been reviewed at the previous Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting. She reported that Issue Statement S3, submitted by Butte County, is being reviewed by the Plenary Group as an addition to Scoping Document 1. She reminded participants that Resource Goals could be added to any

Issue Sheet, however existing Resource Goals will not be wordsmithed, and the Study Development Task Force will address Existing Information and Information Needs.

- One participant asked to have the Issues Addressed section added to each Issue Sheet. The consulting staff agreed to add the Issues Addressed to the next revision.

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group reviewed, revised and completed Issue Sheets R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6, S1 and S2. The revised Issue Sheets are appended to this summary as Attachment 6. The following paragraphs summarize additional comments or discussions beyond the revisions reflected in Attachment 6.

S1

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group discussed the suitability of the Geographic Scope within the context of the Project's economic impacts on the local and regional economy. Some participants felt that the stated Geographic Scope was too limiting, and that it should be revised to include all of Butte County. Thomas Wegge of the consulting team suggested that this would be appropriate since different areas of Butte County will receive different impacts. He added that it is likely the most significant impacts would be in the City of Oroville, and the significance of impacts would diminish the further away from the city. However, depending on the type of business, it would be possible for a small community further from the facility to have a disproportionately significant economic impact. He felt that having Butte County as the boundary of the Geographic Scope was appropriate to start the study plan process. Participants agreed that the Geographic Scope could be fine-tuned as the study plan for S1 is developed.

S2

Craig Jones from the State Water Contractors asked if this was an Issue that needed to be settled at this point in the process, or if it could be deferred as a settlement agreement. He reminded participants that DWR does not set local rates for electricity and that if Butte County wanted to participate in the Northern California Power Agreement or create a municipal power agency to explore different power arrangements, those actions can be addressed in a different forum. He suggested that the issue be put in a "bin" for future action during settlement agreement talks. Some participants questioned whether the Work Group had the authority to take this action before the release of SD1, and suggested the major advocate of S2 should be present for this decision.

The Facilitator reminded participants that other Work Groups had placed issues in bins, and that one of the responsibilities of the Work Groups is to determine whether an issue is FERC related. Wayne Dyok of the consulting team agreed and suggested that the issue would not be taken off the table, but would rather be deferred as a potential settlement agreement element.

One participant suggested that DWR meet with the issue advocates to determine whether to defer study on this issue. Michael Pierce asked that in addition to meeting with Mike Kelley, Butte County be represented and Pete Soderberg of The Dangermond Group asked that the JPA representative also be part of that meeting.

R5

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group discussed the similarities between Issue Sheet R5 and LM3 being developed by the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group. There was desire expressed to resolve any overlap between the two so that duplicate study efforts can be avoided. Participants discussed which issues within R5 should be kept in this Issue Sheet and what, if any should be addressed in LM3. The Facilitator responded that the RAMs would be reviewing each Issue Sheet for continuity and overlap with Issue Sheets from other Work Groups. She added that the RAMs were anticipating developing a matrix that would clearly show which study plans are addressing which issues and where there was potential overlap. She explained that the Plenary Group would be providing a similar assessment of issues and study plans once all

the Study Plans were done. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to make a Resource Goal that referenced coordination with LM3. Dale Hoffman-Floerke stated that DWR staff involved with the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group and the Land Use, Land Management, and Aesthetics Work Group would draft language to coordinate R5 and LM3.

Participants discussed the relationship between Issue Sheet development and Scoping Document 1 currently under review by the Plenary Group. There was concern that some information in the Issue Sheets did not appear in SD1. The Facilitator responded that the two processes were similar but proceeding on separate tracks. The information needs identified during the development of SD1 and the companion document SD2, would be integrated into the study plans developed by the Work Groups.

R6

Craig Jones suggested that this Issue Sheet might be more suitable as a mitigation or settlement agreement as it appears to address issues that may be identified in R5. He added that R6 could be nested in R5 as a Resource Goal, or mitigation. Eva Begley of DWR responded that R6 addresses environmental concerns not stated in R5, and should be kept as a stand-alone issue. She added that R6 appears to be assessing the conflicts between environmental and recreation issues. Eric See of DWR agreed and stated that coordination with issues from the Environmental Work Group could be nested in this Issue Sheet. Craig asked to modify the Issue Sheet to include a statement of nexus to project operations and the eventual determination of project related impacts to recreation within the geographic scope of the issue. Harry Williamson of the National Park Service agreed, and added that FERC and non-FERC issues need to be addressed before study plans are developed. Harry is concerned that the process of focusing issues into manageable study plans has not yet happened. He asked how much discretion the Study Development Task Force would have in focusing issues to study plans. The Facilitator responded that one of the goals of study plan development is identifying issues for study, and developing a protocol for dealing with issues that are not studied. She added that FERC is not clear on which issues should be studied, allowing each applicant to determine the parameters for determining which issues have nexus to the project and which do not. Craig Jones added that FERC asks about project impacts and project effect when determining the need for facility development. Steve Nachtman of the consulting team responded by reading the following from FERC document Recreation Development at Licensed Hydroelectric Projects (Introduction, page 1, -second paragraph):

“On December 27, 1965, FERC issued Order No. 313, which amended the General Policy and Interpretations section of the Commission’s regulations (18 CFR Part 2) to ensure that the ultimate development of recreation resources at all projects is consistent with area recreational needs. Specifically, 18 CFR Part 2 was amended to include section 2.7, which requires licensees to: (1) acquire lands to assure optimum development of the recreational resources afforded by the project; (2) develop suitable public recreational facilities with adequate public access, considering the needs of physically handicapped persons in the design of facilities and access; (3) coordinate efforts with other agencies in the development of recreation areas and facilities; (4) provide for planning, operation, and maintenance of these facilities; and (5) inform the public of opportunities for recreation at licensed projects.”

Craig Jones responded that the test of cause and effect is still required, adding that it was important to note that FERC will not require an applicant to provide a facility if the need has not been demonstrated.

The participants noted that Level of Analysis for all of the Issue Statements should include a literature review. Craig Jones suggested that coordination with the Engineering and Operations and Environmental Work Groups to make sure that modeling activities are organized efficiently will

be necessary if the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group is to finish a Recreation Plan. Wayne Dyok indicated that the Engineering and Operations Work Group is working on a diagram that will show the interactions between the modeling effort and other Work Groups.

Next Meeting

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to meet on:

Date: Thursday, October 4, 2001
Time: 6:00 PM to 10:00 PM.
Location: To be determined.

Agreements Made

1. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to review and comment on the Existing Information and Information Needs matrices provided by DWR. They agreed to provide comment by September 7, 2001 to DWR.
2. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to meet again on October 4, 2001 from 6:00 PM to 10:00 PM. Location to be determined.

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

Action Item #R30: Review information lists and send additional information to DWR.
Responsible: Work Group Participants
Due Date: September 10, 2001

Action Item #R31: Insert Issues Addressed by Issue Statement to each Issue Sheet.
Responsible: DWR staff/Consulting team
Due Date: September 10, 2001

Action Item #R32: Discuss S2 with Mike Kelley, Butte County and JPA representatives to determine fate of Issue Statement
Responsible: DWR staff/Consulting team
Due Date: September 10, 2001

Action Item #R33: Prepare draft language to address coordination between LM3 and R5.
Responsible: DWR staff
Due Date: September 10, 2001

Action Item #R34: Insert excerpt from FERC document Recreation Development at Licensed Hydroelectric Projects in summary notes.
Responsible: Consulting team
Due Date: Completed

Action Item #R35: Consolidate existing information and information needs and begin developing list of study plans.
Responsible: Study Plan Development Task Force
Due Date: Task Force meeting September 12